| 1 | | |
|----------|---|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATE | ES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | KASRA KHADIVI DIMBALI, an | Case No. 2:09-CV-02242-FCD-EFB |
| 12 | individual, | ORDER RE CASE STATUS UPDATE AND STIPULATION TO EXTEND |
| 13 | Plaintiff, |) CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY'S TIME TO RESPOND TO THE |
| 14 | VS. |) <u>COMPLAINT</u>) |
| 15 | CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, a Texas corporation and DOES 1 through 10, Inclusive, |))) |
| 16 17 | Defendant. |))) |
| 18 | FOR GOOD CAUSE SHOWN, THE COURT ORDERS that ConocoPhillips Company's | |
| 19 | ("COP") time to respond to Plaintiff's complaint is extended 90 days so that Plaintiff can file and | |
| 20 | the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation can rule on a motion to vacate the Conditional | |
| 21 | Transfer Order transferring this case to the Northern District of California. Should the Judicial | |
| 22 | Panel not rule on COP's request within 90 days, COP shall report further to the Court so that it | |
| 23 | may revisit whether a further extension would be appropriate. | |
| 24 | Nothing herein shall prevent Plaintiff's ability to seek a temporary restraining order or | |
| 25 | preliminary injunction against COP before COP has responded to the complaint, or file a motion | |
| 26 | to remand to state court. | |
| 27 | Dated: November 3, 2009 | Jung C Smmy |
| 28 | | (FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR. UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE |